

Atty. Dkt. No. 074022-3302

REMARKS

Claims 59, 60 and 61 have been amended. No amendments have been made to obviate prior art or to overcome any rejections. Support for the amendments is found generally. Accordingly, the amendments and the new claims raise no issue of new matter.

Interview Summary

The undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Marschel on January 5, 2005 to discuss the remaining issues in the case. Agreement was reached on all issues as reflected by the amendments and remarks herein. This Amendment After Final Rejection was filed at the suggestion of the Examiner.

Improper Multiple Dependence

The Examiner has objected to claim 61 as being a multiple dependent claim that depends from other multiple dependent claims. Applicants have amended claim 61 to refer only to non-multiple dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

New Matter Rejection

The Examiner asserts that the language in claims 56, 58 and 60 referring to the absence of interconnections between channels is new matter because the specification allegedly only describes this feature in conjunction with achieving laminar flow character. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is without basis because there is no requirement for a functional result to be recited with a clear negative limitation on structure (i.e. no interconnections). Furthermore, the Examiner's attention is directed to the specification at page 28, lines 8-9 which teaches avoid interconnections between channels but does not mention